



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/789,699   | 02/27/2004  | Federico Uslenghi    | 60,246-341; 10,740  | 9287             |
| 26/096 7590 03/04/2008<br>CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.<br>400 WEST MAPLE ROAD<br>SUITE 350<br>BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| JOYNER, KEVIN  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 1797   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 03/04/2008   |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/789,699

**Applicant(s)**

USLENGHI ET AL.

**Examiner**

KEVIN C. JOYNER

**Art Unit**

1797

***--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --***

THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 17-20.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Leigh McKane/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that the reference of Suenga does not teach a shield positioned on an opposite side of the monolith from the ultraviolet light. However, as shown in Drawing 7 of Suenga the module comprises two shields (3) disposed on the far left and far right sides of the module. Two ultraviolet light sources (4) are located between the shields but before a monolith (2). Between the two ultraviolet light sources, two monoliths are provided in order to decontaminate a fluid. As shown in drawing 7, the ultraviolet light source located on the left side of the module has a monolith disposed between it and the reflecting shield on the far right side of the module. Therefore, Suenga meets the limitations of the claim of "a shield positioned on an opposite side of the monolith from the ultraviolet light source."

The Applicant also argues that the shield that is positioned on the opposite end of the compartment relative to each light source would not reflect ultraviolet light from the light source at the opposite end. However, the ultraviolet light from light source (4) on the far left side is fully capable of projecting through both monoliths (2) and reflecting off the shield (3) on the far right side of the module.

The Applicant continues to argue that one of ordinary skill would not modify the height of the shield to a height that is less than the height of the monolith. Reducing the height of the shield would result in a reduced amount of wind contacting the mirror such that the mirror would vibrate less. Less vibration of the mirror would directly result in less reflectivity of the device. The Examiner contends that making the height of the shield smaller than the height of the monolith would result in less vibration. However, the vibration is provided to change the angle of the reflected light source, not the amount of light that is reflected. As such, the reflected light would perform sufficiently to decontaminate the monoliths. Furthermore, as described in the Final Office Action mailed on December 12, 2007, motivation for making the shield smaller was provided in order to allow more airflow to reach the filter in order to purify the air, and to reduce manufacturing costs of the shield itself. The motivation was not provided to optimize the reflectivity of the light.